UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----X Docket#

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 21-cr-00042-WFK-1

- versus -: U.S. Courthouse

: Brooklyn, New York

DARREN CHARLES STEWART, : January 28, 2021
Defendant : 3:45 PM

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR PROCEEDING BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHERYL L. POLLAK UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

A P P E A R A N C E S: (TELEPHONICALLY)

For the Government: Seth DuCharme, Esq. Acting U.S. Attorney

BY: Tara McGrath, Esq.

Assistant U.S. Attorney 271 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201

Vinoo Varghese, Esq. For the Defendant: Gregory Marshall, Esq.

Varghese & Associates, P.C.

2 Wall Street

New York, NY 10005

Transcription Service: Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.

61 Beatrice Avenue

West Islip, New York 11795

laferrara44@gmail.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound-recording, transcript produced by transcription service

```
2
                            Proceedings
              THE CLERK: Criminal Cause for Arraignment,
 1
 2
   case number 21-cr-42, United States v. Darren Stewart.
 3
              Counsel starting with the government, please
 4
   state your appearances.
 5
              MS. MCGRATH: Good afternoon, your Honor.
 6
              Tara McGrath for the government.
 7
              THE COURT: Good afternoon.
 8
              MR. VARGHESE: Varghese & Associates by Vinoo
 9
   Varghese and Gregory Marshall, 2 Wall Street, for Mr.
10
   Stewart.
              Good afternoon, your Honor.
11
12
              THE COURT: Good afternoon.
13
              Mr. Stewart, I take it that you understand
14
   English.
15
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.
16
              THE COURT: Okay. The (audio interference)
17
   anything that's said during these proceedings that you do
18
   not understand, please tell me, all right?
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
19
20
              THE COURT: Okay. The first issue I want to
21
   deal with this afternoon is your consent to proceed by
22
   way of a video conference. Normally, we'd be in the
23
   courthouse, you'd be there with your attorneys, the
2.4
   government's attorney would be there, I would be there
25
   and we would proceed in person but because of the COVID-
```

```
3
                            Proceedings
   19 pandemic, virtually all of the proceedings in person
 1
 2
   in the courthouse have stopped.
 3
              Now Congress has authorized us to proceed by
   way of a video conference for this proceeding if you
 4
 5
   agree to do that.
              Mr. Varghese, have you discussed this with your
 6
 7
   client?
 8
              MR. VARGHESE: Yes, we did last night, your
 9
   Honor.
10
              THE COURT: All right. Does he consent to
11
   proceed by way of video conference?
12
              MR. VARGHESE: Yes, he does.
13
              THE COURT: Okay. Is that correct, Mr.
14
   Stewart? Do you agree to proceed this afternoon by way
15
   of video conference?
16
              MR. VARGHESE: Yes, your Honor.
17
              THE COURT: Okay. Now you're here today
18
   because the grand jury has returned an indictment
19
   charging you with seven counts. The first six counts
20
   charge you with distribution of child pornography.
21
   Essentially, you've been charged with knowingly and
22
   intentionally distributing visual depictions using a
23
   means of interstate and foreign commerce in which minors
2.4
   engaged in sexually explicit conduct were depicted, all
25
   in violation of United States law and the last count,
```

```
4
                            Proceedings
 1
   Count 7, charge you with possession of child pornography.
 2
              First of all, have you reviewed the charges in
 3
   the indictment with your attorney?
 4
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
 5
              THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Varghese, have you
   reviewed the indictment with your client and advised him
 6
 7
   of his rights?
 8
              MR. VARGHESE: Yes. Mr. Marshall, who is fully
 9
   employed here at Varghese & Associates, read through the
10
   indictment with him. We will be filing a notice of
11
   appearance for Mr. Marshall shortly, we just haven't done
12
   it yet, your Honor but he read through the indictment.
13
   He's sitting right next to me, he (audio interference)
14
   indictment with him.
15
              MR. MARSHALL: Yes, Judge, I did (audio
   interference).
16
17
              THE COURT: Okay. And do you have any concern
18
   following your review of the indictment with your client
19
   as to whether or not he understands the charges?
20
              MR. MARSHALL: No, Judge. He understands the
21
             I gave him an opportunity to ask questions as
22
   well and he indicated he understands the charges.
23
              THE COURT: And is he prepared to enter a plea
2.4
   today?
25
              MR. VARGHESE: Yes, of not guilty, your Honor.
```

```
5
                            Proceedings
 1
              THE COURT: To all seven counts, I assume?
 2
              MR. VARGHESE: Yes. Yes, your Honor. Thank
 3
   you.
              THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Stewart, I want to
 4
 5
   advise you that you have the right to remain silent.
   Anything you say except what you say to your attorneys
 6
 7
   can be used against you.
 8
              Do you understand that?
 9
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
10
              THE COURT: Now I also want to make sure you
11
   understand that you have the right to be represented by
12
   an attorney in connection with these charges. My
13
   understanding is that you have retained counsel in this
14
   matter. If for some reason, you cannot afford counsel,
15
   the Court will appoint an attorney for you.
16
              Do you understand that?
17
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
18
              THE COURT: Okay. Ms. McGrath, do we have a
19
   date for Mr. Stewart to appear before the district judge
20
   in this matter?
21
              MS. MCGRATH: Your Honor, I am conferring with
22
   Judge Kuntz's deputy and am seeking something the week of
23
   March 9th but nothing as of yet has been set.
2.4
              THE COURT: Okay. Well, let me ask this
25
   question. What are we going to do with respect to the
```

1 | question of bail?

2.

2.4

MS. MCGRATH: Your Honor, the government is seeking detention and I understand defense counsel would like to make a bail proposal.

THE COURT: Okay. But what's the basis for the government to request detention in the first instance?

MS. MCGRATH: Your Honor, the defendant is charged with six counts of distributing child pornography and one count of possessing child pornography between January (audio interference) through November 2020. The evidence indicates he is a prolific collector of child pornography. He has a collection comprising thousands of videos which he stores and shares in a variety of platforms. He's also an Australian National who is formerly working for the Australian Trade Commission.

Under 18 USC 3142(e)(3)(E), there is a rebuttable presumption of detention and in light of his foreign ties and the extremely serious nature of the charged offenses, the government feels there's no combination or condition that could reasonably assure his appearance or the safety of any other person or the community.

And just looking at the four factors outlined in the Bail Reform Act, each of them weighs in favor of his detention. The first being the nature and

2.4

Proceedings

circumstances of the crime, on numerous occasions over a month long period, the defendant distributed child pornography to undercover agents on (audio interference) platform. These videos involved young children, many of whom were toddlers being sexually abused by adults.

The defendant professed to having a favorite video, (audio interference) in Count 4, is almost 16 minutes long, depicting a toddler who appears to be drugged being anally penetrated by an adult. This is the tip of the iceberg in terms of the defendant's collection.

He also possessed child pornography involving prepubescent children on an electronic hard drive recovered from his bedroom in a porn folder and the hard drive contained photos of the defendant and his family as well. The heinous nature and pervasiveness of the crime weighs in favor of remand.

The second factor being the history and characteristics of the defendant also weigh in favor of remand. In conversations with an undercover agent, the defendant made concessions that showed that his conduct extends far beyond what has been charged and all of which states he's a dangerous man.

He admitted that his preference was to see "bubs (ph.) and toddlers getting fucked up" and that he

"loves rape and nasty stuff".

2.4

He admitted to having a collection of thousands of videos and he admitted to sexually abusing his own nephew in the past.

He also has very significant foreign ties which creates a considerable flight risk. He's an Australian National with an Australian passport and he's in this country on a sponsored working visa. He has no relatives in the area and it appears he has very few close friends.

He's also not actively working. His role with the Australian Trade has been suspended and it doesn't seem he has a stable living condition either. He had formerly been living with a roommate who I believe is on the line, Kong Peng (ph.), and they both moved out into separate accommodations. I understand that if the defendant is released, he intends to live with his roommate again in the roommate's new apartment but it's unclear that this is a stable or consistent living environment.

And the third condition, the danger imposed by his release also speaks to the importance of remand here. The danger is that the defendant will continue to engage in the crimes for which he's been charged. Here, even if the Adam Walsh factors don't obviate that danger. A common condition is that the defendant's electronic

Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.

2.4

Proceedings

devices and internet usage be monitored. However, if he's living with Kong Peng, I understand that Kong Peng is a computer programmer who has a number of different electronic devices himself for purposes of his work. There's no ability to monitor what Kong Peng is doing on his devices or what the defendant is able to do on Kong Peng's devices.

The same would be true if anyone else came to that apartment with an electronic device that the defendant has access to. It's going to be particularly difficult to monitor this defendant given his practices. He uses foreign-based end-to-end encrypted platforms like, Telegram, Flickr and Mega.NZ, each of which professes to be beyond (audio interference) subpoena power and which prevent anyone from -- the sender or recipient of the method from seeing what's been sent.

Likewise, GPS monitoring which is a common condition, in these cases while helpful, doesn't prevent the defendant from cutting it and running it. It just goes pretrial a bit of an advanced notice, so that they can begin the chase.

And being both an avid collector and distributor of child pornography, he has been fueling an industry that viciously and irreparably harms children and the community at large and if released, there's a

Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.

significant concern that he'll continue to do so.

2.1

2.4

A fourth condition is the strength of the evidence. The distribution count stems from the defendant's conversations with undercovers on social media accounts. The subscriber information for those accounts including telephone numbers and email addresses all go back to the defendant, as do the IP hit. In fact, IP hits show that the defendant accessed some of these social media accounts from his workplace and the IP hits go to his own log in at his place at work.

As mentioned, the external hard drive on which the CP was found had photos of the defendant and his family on vacation. Accordingly, the evidence here is very strong and that also creates a flight risk.

Finally, just speaking to flight risk, given the seriousness of the charges and the sentencing implications, that also creates the (indiscernible) incentive for the defendant to flee. He faces a five-year mandatory minimum on the distribution charges and the government calculates his guidelines sentencing range to be between 135 to 168 months imprisonment.

And I should note that the government allowed the defendant to self-surrender this morning. We gave defense counsel less than 24-hours notice to do so with the understanding that HSI agents were poised and ready

to arrest and bring the defendant in should he fail to arrive at the time designated.

At that time, the defendant was unaware of the charges, the conduct to what they related and the sentencing implications. It's a very different thing to think in the abstract that you may be arrested and you may be in trouble for some of the conduct you engaged in and to know today that you've been charged with seven counts and that you face over ten years in prison.

Your Honor, for all those reasons, the government respectfully requests a permanent order of detention be ordered because the defendant is both a serious flight risk and he poses a considerable danger to the community.

THE COURT: All right.

Counsel?

2.4

MR. VARGHESE: Thank you, your Honor. I am going to just address many of the things about Mr.

Stewart. This is a man who has been in the country now for approximately eight years. He was gainfully employed by initially, the Australian Consulate and then the Australian Trade Commission.

In November -- just let me take a further step back, he has no prior criminal history. In November, HSI for the government executed a search warrant on his

2.4

Proceedings

apartment. He could've fled then, your Honor. Instead of fleeing then, they didn't arrest him, he hired us, basically the next day. He came to our office and he hired us and that point, we reached out to Ms. McGrath and we informed her we're his counsel, please give us notice. This client isn't going anywhere. He's going to self-surrender if you give us the opportunity to do that.

Ms. McGrath already mentioned that he didn't -she gave us less than 24-hours notice, try 12-hours
notice. I got an email from Ms. McGrath at 7:28 p.m.

Now she did call the office in the morning but just after
a return call with no indication of anything, it was
yesterday, we had two hearings, at 7:28 p.m., I'm at home
with my kids and I see this email saying it's urgent that
we speak. I, after a little phone tag, we get back on
the phone and at approximately 8 o'clock, she tells me
that they've indicted him and needs to surrender at 7:30
a.m. in this morning.

I asked her if he could surrender on Friday. I had a bunch of conflicts, including taking my own nine-year-old to get a COVID test because his school has been shut down, he needs it. So I did that this morning.

That's why Mr. Marshall handled, rightfully he's quite able and handled the pretrial interview.

I was able to get in touch with Mr. Stewart,

2.4

Proceedings

explained the situation to him and when Ms. McGrath speaks about abstract, no, actually that's not even close to accurate because the search warrant in this case talked about manufacturing, the charge was manufacture of child pornography which carries, with the guidelines, far greater sentencing than what Ms. McGrath described. So we were to the extent somewhat relieved that he was charged with distribution and possession.

This is -- and obviously with less than 12-hours notice for a situation -- you know, it's not a situation where we can come up with sureties. We were able to speak to Mr. Kong, who is on the line, who Mr. Stewart is going to live with, has been living with. They had to take separate entrances, Mr. Kong, downsized -- excuse me, separate residences right across the street from each other because Mr. Stewart upon the notification of the -- upon the search warrant execution in November, the government, and I spoke to Ms. McGrath about this, why this was necessary, the government contacted the Australian Trade Commission and informed him that he was under investigation for possession of child pornography and they promptly suspended him without pay.

So you know, the government created a situation that we believe was unnecessary, extremely punitive because he's under investigation. I mean, I would like

2.4

Proceedings

to think there's a presumption of innocence. I know the Court understands it, we understand it but that's been thrown out.

Instead of running, where he could've gone to some country with a nonextradition treaty -- Australia has an extradition treaty with the United States, obviously one of the U.S.'s firm partners of the world, he didn't choose to run. He didn't try to get his passport back. They have his passport and he instead hired us at great financial cost to himself. He's not a rich man, Judge and a detention in this case is just punishing a person who doesn't have the resources -- he spent his resources on hiring us and this is why we were able to speak to him and get in touch with him and self-surrender him. He's committed to dealing with this case, your Honor.

There is no reason why he can't be placed under house arrest with ankle bracelet, with real-time computer monitoring as he did in the case and phone monitoring.

You know, the government loves to cast aspersions on people, especially on people they don't know and presuming that Mr. Kong is going to be involved in something that he's not. I mean, these are all aspersions without basis and so -- without bases, excuses me.

2.4

Proceedings

He's not charged with manufacture. In terms of risk to the community, as Ms. McGrath alluded to, it's a rebuttable presumption. He's not charged with manufacturing. The charges are serious. We're not in anyway underplaying that but I want to address some of the things that were in the pretrial report, bottom of page, she assessed him with nonappearance, limited -- number one, pretrial says limited familial property and financial ties, all -- this is all true. He doesn't have people here in the United States that can put together a bond package and obviously, the government requested detention. No bond package would be sufficient for them.

Yes, he has a substance abuse history. He's been clean for several months. Despite that, he was gainfully employed until November when the U.S. government informed the Australian government that he was under investigation for child pornography.

His substantial tie to a foreign country, foreign government are Australia, one of the U.S.'s possibly main partners with the world, a country that has an extradition treaty with the United States and yes, he's a noncitizen, he's here on a work visa.

Access to travel documents, that's not true. They have their passport.

Unstable and suitable living conditions, Judge,

2.4

Proceedings

you know, he had to downsize because of his -- that he was under investigation and in essence what this is a veiled way of saying you're not rich enough to have what they would call suitable living condition.

And in terms of danger, the nature of the instant offense, Judge, obviously I have had clients in this district charged with the same things and being able to be let out on bail. Some of them, unfortunately -- unfortunately, Mr. Stewart doesn't have the money that he (sic) has but they weren't confined to home detention.

So what we're suggesting to the Court which I will ensure he's coming back and Mr. Stewart has demonstrated that, Judge. If he wanted to run, he would've done so after November. Instead, he hired us. Ms. McGrath and I speak at 8 p.m. last night. Mr. Stewart is at Homeland Security at 7:30 a.m. And if there's anybody who is more committed, I can't think of anybody with such short notice, more committed to respecting this court, the Eastern District of New York, in dealing with these charges than Mr. Stewart. He didn't have to deplete his savings to hire us and your Honor, he's here.

And I think, Judge, with ankle bracelet, home detention, you know, limiting himself to go to pretrial and our office with prior -- you know, under the normal

17 Proceedings conditions, monitoring, real time monitoring of his 1 2 computers and his phones and there's no -- this man 3 should be allowed to do that. Let me take a step back, in addition, he's Type 4 5 2 Diabetic, Judge. Obviously puts him at high risk of COVID mortality, of death from COVID-19. We know the 6 7 situations in the MDC and MCC, these have been dealt 8 with, written about. The chief judges in both the 9 Southern and the Eastern Districts of New York have been 10 dealing with this issue, particularly limited access that defense attorneys have in dealing with this (audio 11 12 interference) is we can't just go there the way we used 13 to be able to. It's very difficult to get an 14 appointment. I recently had a client who is supposed to call, have a call arranged with us, and it didn't happen, 15 16 Judge. It's been weeks. THE COURT: I understand that. 17 18 MR. VARGHESE: This is the (indiscernible). 19 THE COURT: I'm very familiar with the 20 conditions at MDC and MCC in my current role but that, in 21 my mind, is not the reason to disregard all of the other 22 factors that one is required to consider under the Bail Reform Act. 23 2.4

And as the government's attorney has laid out, these are very serious crimes. There is based on my

25

review of the information that is before me, strong evidence that the defendant has committed the offenses.

The government has a strong case.

2.4

I am very concerned about the fact that he does not have -- he's got his position here on a visa, he's not a citizen of the United States and a green card holder. He's an Australian National and the fact that we have an extradition treaty with Australia is better than having someone who has connections with a country with which have no extradition treaty or that does not eliminate the risk that he has great incentive to flee, given the fact that according to the government, he is facing a very significant period of time.

I appreciate the fact that his former roommate has offered to come up with a bond, but I find it insufficient to overcome the risk of flight that I see and the danger to the community.

And I just want to make sure I heard Ms.

McGrath properly, did you say that he admitted to one of
the agents that he had sexually abused his nephew? Did I
mishear you on that?

MS. MCGRATH: Your Honor, no. In an undercover conversation, the defendant admitted -- sorry, the defendant admitted in a conversation with an undercover agent that in the past that he had sexually abused his

19 Proceedings nephew. 1 2. THE COURT: All right. Well, so then I find he's not only a risk of flight but a danger to the 3 community and I'm going to order him detained pending 4 5 trial. The only other issue, I guess is what about 6 7 time? MS. MCGRATH: Your Honor, I heard from Judge 8 9 Kuntz's deputy that they could have the first status 10 conference on Friday, March 12th at 10:30 a.m. The 11 government would ask that time be excluded until then so 12 that the government can produce discovery to defense 13 counsel. 14 THE COURT: Mr. Varghese, do you have a position on the order of excludable delay? 15 16 MR. VARGHESE: We have no objection to the 17 exclusion of time, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: All right. So Mr. Stewart, under 19 the constitution and the laws of the United States, 20 you're entitled to a speedy and public trial by jury 21 commencing within 70 days of the filing of the indictment 22 that's the formal charges that I reviewed with you earlier. 23 2.4 What the government has asked me to do is 25 exclude or not count the time from today until March 12th

20 Proceedings when we're going to be appearing before the district 1 judge in this matter and the reason for excluding the time is that during this period, the government will be 3 providing your attorney with information, discovery, 4 5 evidence that they have against you with respect to these charges and potentially engaging in discussions with your 6 7 attorney to see if the case can be resolved through a 8 plea rather than through trial. 9 Has this been explained to you by your 10 attorney, Mr. Stewart? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: And do you consent to proceeding by 13 -- in other words, to me entering this order of 14 excludable delay at this time? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Sorry, your Honor, I didn't understand that. 16 17 THE COURT: Do you agree to me entering an 18 order excluding the time from today until you see the 19 district judge in this case? 20 THE DEFENDANT: I'm not sure what that means, 21 your Honor. Could I ask Mr. Varghese's advice on that? 22 THE COURT: Sure. Mr. Varghese, maybe I am not 23 explaining it properly. 2.4 MR. VARGHESE: Yeah. I did not, in fairness to 25 Mr. Stewart, I did not discuss speedy trial exclusions

```
21
                            Proceedings
   with him. It's normally something I don't -- we don't do
 1
 2
   in advance.
 3
              This is procedural, Darren and it's necessary
   for us to receive the discovery and to challenge the
 4
 5
   assertions made by Ms. McGrath today.
 6
              THE DEFENDANT: All right.
 7
              THE COURT: Okay. So do you agree?
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
 8
 9
              THE COURT: Okay. Anything else today?
10
              MS. MCGRATH: Your Honor, I don't believe we've
11
   done the Rule 5 app notice.
12
              THE COURT: Yes, thank you. Thank you. I feel
13
   like I've done it with you already like three or four
14
   times, so that's why I forgot.
15
              So under the revised amended Rule 5 app, I
16
   direct the prosecution to comply with its obligation
17
   under <u>Brady v. Maryland</u> and its progeny to disclose to
18
   the defense all information whether admissible or not,
19
   that is favorable to the defendant, material either to
20
   quilt or to punishment and known to the prosecution.
21
              Possible consequences for noncompliance may
22
   include dismissal of individual charges or the entire
23
   case, exclusion of evidence and professional discipline
2.4
   and court sanctions on the attorney's responsible.
25
              I will be entering a written order more fully
```

```
22
                            Proceedings
    describing this obligation and the possible consequences
 1
 2.
   of failing to meet it and I direct the prosecution to
 3
   review and comply with that order.
              Ms. McGrath, does the prosecution confirm that
 4
   it understands it obligations and will fulfill them?
 5
 6
              MS. MCGRATH: Yes, your Honor and the
 7
    government understands will comply.
 8
              THE COURT: All right. Anything else?
 9
              MS. MCGRATH: Nothing for the government.
10
    Thank you, your Honor.
11
              THE COURT: Counsel, anything else for the
12
    defendant?
13
              MR. VARGHESE: Not at present, your Honor.
14
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you, everyone.
15
   Have a nice evening.
16
              THE CLERK: Thank you, everyone.
17
              MS. MCGRATH: Thank you.
18
                         (Matter Concluded)
19
                               -000-
20
2.1
22
23
2.4
25
```

I C C

I, LINDA FERRARA, hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the said proceedings is a true and accurate transcript from the electronic soundrecording of the proceedings reduced to typewriting in the above-entitled matter.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor a relative or employee of such attorney or counsel, or financially interested directly or indirectly in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand this 8th day of March 2021.

AAERT CET 656 Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.